

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**


DARRELL RICARDO WHYTE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 3:23-cv-01321
)	
BRENNA K. BELL, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
	<u>ORDER</u>	

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. No. 23) recommending that the Court grant Defendant Jennings H. Jones’s (“Jones”) and Defendant Sonya Smith Wright’s (“Wright”) respective motions to dismiss (Doc. Nos. 15, 17) (“Motions”). Plaintiff Darrell Ricardo Whyte (“Whyte”) has not filed timely objections to the R&R despite the R&R’s specific warnings regarding waiver. (See Doc. No. 23 at 11).

Having thoroughly reviewed the R&R, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Specifically, the Court agrees that: (1) the Motions are unopposed because Whyte failed to respond to them; (2) Whyte’s “demand” that his requirement to respond to the Motions be put on hold until “he was personally satisfied of when Jones and Wright were served with process and satisfied that they had responded to the [C]omplaint in a timely manner” was meritless; and (3) the Complaint does not state plausible claims of relief against Jones or Wright. (See Doc. No. 13 at 5–10).

Accordingly, the R&R (Doc. No. 23) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED**; Jones’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 15) is **GRANTED**; Wright’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 17) is **GRANTED**; and the claims against Jones and Wright are **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



WAVERLY D. CRENSHAW, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE